

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Mykel Johnson,	)	
	)	C.A. No. 6:19-1576-HMH-KFM
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	<b>OPINION &amp; ORDER</b>
	)	
	)	
Randolph Williams, Warden of Lieber,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.<sup>1</sup> Mykel Johnson (“Johnson”) is a pro se state prisoner seeking habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his Report and Recommendation filed on June 21, 2019, Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends dismissing Johnson’s petition without prejudice and without requiring the Respondent to file a return. (R&R, generally, ECF No. 12.)

The court granted Johnson’s motion for an extension and extended the time to file objections until July 15, 2019. Johnson filed timely objections to the Report and

---

<sup>1</sup> The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Recommendation on July 8, 2019.<sup>2</sup> (Obj., generally, ECF No. 16.) Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Johnson's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that Johnson's petition is dismissed without prejudice and without requiring the Respondent to file a return. It is further

**ORDERED** that a certificate of appealability is denied because Johnson has failed to make "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.  
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina  
July 24, 2019

---

<sup>2</sup> Houston v. Lack, 487 U.S. 266 (1988).

### **NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The Petitioner is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.